



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REFUTES POPULAR FALLACY.

These Australian and South American reminders are the most drastic and startling yet, that every time we burden our own people with new battleships we contribute to burdening other peoples, too. "Every addition to the fighting forces of one country," declared the recent Philadelphia Peace Congress in its strong platform, "leads at once to corresponding increase in other countries, and these secondary increases are made to serve in their turn as conclusive arguments for still greater and still more injurious and demoralizing expenditures and efforts by all the powers. It is obvious that this self-multiplying and self-perpetuating process can end only in physical and financial exhaustion, unless it can be halted by some kind of mutual agreement."

Whatever else is to be said about the present strained relations between Great Britain and Germany, the most noteworthy thing is the utter refutation which the situation affords of the popular fallacy that the way to insure peace is to prepare for war. Every new Dreadnought which Germany or England builds makes, so far from an added bond of peace between them, just so much more war talk and war danger.

These monstrous armaments are not chiefly a defense, but rather a provocation and menace, the chief disturbers now of men's sense of security and peace. This is as true as concerns Brazil and Argentina, and Japan and the United States, as it is of Great Britain and Germany. A wild competition between them as to which shall have the biggest navy, so far from scaring each other into abiding peace, is the surest way to foster abiding mutual distrust and lay train for occasion for war.

It was a sensible remark of Sir Robert Peel's that the duty of governments in time of peace is to take risks. The true statesman is he who knows rightly the different kinds of risks — and in times of peace prepares for peace.

It is reassuring to read the intimations from London and Berlin of the likelihood of some early conference of the great naval powers to see if some understanding with a view to limitation of naval armaments cannot be reached between them; but it was not pleasant to read in connection in the great Berlin journal the expression of fear that the United States could not be brought into conference so easily as the European powers.

That fear certainly is entirely unwarranted; but it is humiliating that the passion for a great navy has in these last years become so extravagant and noisy among us as to beget such a fear in such a quarter. Much sadder would it be if the indulgence of this passion went so far that we should communicate it to all America and help relegate the hemisphere to reaction at the very moment when the world was being born again.

Notes of Progress.

BY A. B. FARQUHAR.

When our remote ancestors from the pleistocene and drift ages, with no knowledge how to find food except to chase and kill it, and little or no division of industry, felt in another tribe near their hunting grounds the presence of a probable competitor whom to tolerate might mean starvation, hostilities were natural enough, and their thoughts and sentiments and canons of duty

were conformed to their necessity. But the human race now holds an altogether different position. Man has learned that he can gain more by mutual service, by exchanging goods with his neighbor than by fighting him. After the epoch-making Sermon on the Mount, it is not easy to think of the relations of men to their fellows and to the Ruler of the Universe as being exactly the same as that held before its delivery. The message of peace on earth, goodwill to men, must thereafter supplant the tiger and bulldog in our natures.

The ethical question of peace or war is essentially the same for nations as for individuals. What is right or wrong on a small scale is right or wrong on a larger, and for the same reasons. Although the peace ideal must supplant the war ideal in the human breast before "the brazen trump of war shall sound no more," yet if we can impress on the conscience of humanity the perfect parallel between the large and the small social aggregate, we shall achieve a great advance on the way of progress, which is the way toward universal peace. In individual dealings peaceful methods have triumphed. There the principles of free commerce, disarmament and arbitration hold undisputed sway, and just those three principles it is our most important duty to introduce, advance and establish in the dealings of nation with nation.

It would not be difficult to show, if time permitted, that the institution of commerce has been a most potent agency in replacing mutual hostility between man and man, and that it has been not less effective, so far as it has been allowed to act, between nation and nation. Agreeing with Cobden that war is the greatest possible evil, we should follow him in doing our utmost for the widest spread of international commercial relations. The more merchant vessels we load for our sister-nations the fewer battleships we shall have to arm against them.

The second principle, that of disarmament, has been slower to meet with universal adoption in private life, for to carry a sword was considered, until a few generations ago, indispensable to a highbred gentleman. This led inevitably to brawls, which could not be avoided until the fashion fell into desuetude. It is idle to hold arbitration meetings and advocate peace among nations without insisting upon disarmament, which is as essential, on its larger scale, to permanent peace as was the abandonment of arm-bearing in polite society. It was quite a disappointment, therefore, to those who hoped most from the recent Hague Conference, that nothing was accomplished in this direction, and especially that a more earnest and vigorous stand was not made by the representatives of our two great nations. Their leaders, President Roosevelt and King Edward VII., have done so much to promote peace and encourage the permanent *entente cordiale* that ought to be universal throughout the earth, and done it so wisely and successfully, that their good work should have been better supported at the Conference. Possibly, however, I regret to add, this might have been inconsistent with the strangely mistaken but evidently quite sincere view of our President that a strong navy is a necessary assistance in maintaining peace.

The Cobden Club published in 1905 a small volume entitled "The Burden of Armament," containing, among other interesting statistics, the fact that the British public debt, which had been reduced by £53,500,000 sterling in nine years preceding 1899, was increased by £163,000,000

in the four years next following, reaching £798,000,000 in 1903. The final tables give numbers of paupers relieved, of vagrants prosecuted, of persons tried for offenses against property, showing in all cases steady reductions until 1899, steady increases per capita from 1900. The four years of military expenditure showed also a marked diminution of consumption of imported luxuries.

Just as a sensitive thermometer shows us a fever, or an astatic needle the vicinity of an electric current, so do these particulars as to pauperism, vagrancy, petty crimes, consumption of luxuries, and the like, point us to the effects which excess of martial ardor has on the great mass of the people. It is all too moderate to say that those excesses introduce elements of weakness rather than strength. Since Great Britain was not attacked or even seriously threatened during those years, the effect was all on the side of weakness, and I am sorry to say that her naval expenditures have been actually increased since the South African war. Whether the war itself was a useless expenditure of money as well as of lives we need not discuss.

But whether Great Britain is a greater sinner than her sisters or not, we must admit that we have been running astray after the false god of militarism all along the line for years past, and that our own country is no better than the rest. Our stump speakers are fond of talking of the heavy military burdens under which Europe is groaning, and yet sixty-five per cent. of the total annual expenditure of the United States government is for army and navy, for pensions, for interest on war debt—all a purely military charge, in the aggregate much greater than the military expenditure of either Great Britain, Germany or France. Great Britain was eager to increase her naval expenditures as soon as she became victorious in South Africa, but our own case in America is even more striking, for never, except under pressure of the foe's presence in our own territory, have we been so mad for more war vessels as just after our triumph over Spain. We fight for security, we say,—we rush into combat in order to conquer a more solid peace, we claim,—and yet the first thing we do when we have got hold of what we went after is to work with might and main and pour out money like water to protect ourselves. Evidently there is something gravely wrong with the theory that the surest peace is the one won by fighting for it.

But to the third principle, that of arbitration, we look as the best practical method of composing and avoiding international conflicts, through practice of the Christian virtue of concession. Although the Hague Conference made less advance on this line than had been hoped, there is yet reason for encouragement, for orderly methods of avoiding private conflicts had a slow and difficult task to establish themselves. We may remember that the courts, as is plainly shown in the name of the "King's Bench," were at first mere personal representatives of the sovereign, the lack of justice of whose earliest verdicts was proved by the amount of private fighting with which they had to be supplemented. Now the courts have ended private fighting, except among a lawless minority. Our encouragement comes when we compare those dark ages with our own. That a like progress will be shown by the international arbitration court is more than probable. We must remember that the best work done by the civil courts is in cases that

never come before them, and that the best work of the international court of arbitration will doubtless be of the same character.

We may derive further encouragement from the manner in which the quarrel between Japan and Russia was settled, the solution of the Moroccan problem, the recent *entente cordiale* formed between Great Britain, France and Russia (which should secure the peace of Europe for all time); although no formal court of arbitration rendered the judgment in any of these cases, the difference is more in form than in principle. Our aim is to bring about the same revolution in public adjustments that the progress of civilization long ago started in private adjustments, the substitution of law for battlefields and bloodshed; and we urge with tireless insistence that a recognized international tribunal be established, as ready to consider the weighty questions within its scope as is the High Court of Chancery, or the Federal Supreme Court of America, to consider whatever is brought before it.

Our cause was greatly advanced by the assembling of the Hague Conference a year ago last June. That all the powers should have been driven, by the mastering force of the world's growing moral sentiment, to give heed to a call for a peaceful settlement of their differences was a splendid victory, and although the result was disappointing, as we have seen, in some respects, there was nothing in the proceedings to detract from its significance. Half a century ago no such meeting could have been held.

Although the permanent international court of arbitral justice to which we hopefully looked is still unprovided, and there was hesitancy about making a definite arrangement for a third conference, from what I saw of it when at The Hague I fully agreed with our leading representative, Mr. Choate, who remarked, "We cannot expect to succeed all at once, or to avoid war altogether, but great progress is being made, and the Conference not only justified its calling, but is a landmark in international development." He instanced particularly its convention for the orderly collection of contract debts, substituting arbitration and an appeal to reason for force and an appeal to arms, and its establishing a prize court to safeguard neutrals.

It cannot be denied that, with all the progress that is coming to encourage this youngest and, as we all hope, best of the centuries, there are a few discordant notes that still too surely tell our waiting ear that progress is not fulfillment. Even in the ratification of an international arbitration treaty our United States Senate was moved, by the prompting of some voice echoing down from the Dark Ages, to make reservation of "cases affecting the honor of the two contracting States." This is readily recognizable as a mere subterfuge. The interesting point is its origin. The word "honor" in such connection comes straight from the famed code of the duelist, in which honor was recognized as something which the shedding of human blood was required to satisfy. Among gentlemen in this twentieth century the duelist's honor is well nigh forgotten, and that the same word should be used in the same sense in international dealings is an interesting proof how far the nation lags behind its component units in the march of civilization. This chatter about a national honor that calls for acts

that are in truth the foulest national disgrace, and other puerilities that illustrate the medieval standards under which the dealings of the nations are still conducted, need not long discourage us. Wherever the proposition to arbitrate is favorably entertained in any shape, there we see the faces of men turned the right way. Let us hope, and act as in our ability lies, and we shall soon find them moving on the path to lasting peace.

York, Pa.

In the Wake of the Fleet.

A writer (F. S. S.) in the September number of *The Friend* (Honolulu, T. H.), who saw the great parade of the battle fleet, makes the following reflections, among others, upon what has been left, and not left, in the wake of the fleet:

"A third thing which trailed along that evening in the middle of the wake was the moonlight, or rather, the moonshine, of our bland and naïve assurance to humanity that our hard-hitting navy is a sort of benevolent institution designed for the preservation of the peace of the world. Hearken, ye belligerent nations of the earth, to our evangel of peace! Prepare, if you will, for war: we are doing nothing but having our feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of Peace. To this end we estimate that our Colossus requires forty-eight of these ten-million-dollar Dreadnought sandals of peace.

" 'Twenty-four on the East foot,
Twenty-four on the West,
And the Devil take the hindmost
If ever it comes to a test.'"

"We once had faith in the power of justice, but that faith does not shout loud in the wake of our fleet, which has everywhere stirred up anew a martial spirit and a trust in the force of arms. Under the reign of faith in the power of justice we have been at peace with all foreign nations for the space of a century; the pen has proved itself mighty for every emergency; why now should we revert to type and flourish the sword?

"Constructive work does not thrive in the wake of the fleet. Our representatives this year have been voting away seventy per cent. of the entire revenues of the government for a war budget. With war prospects so remote as ours, we question whether our government does wisely to speculate in war futures to the extent of seventy per cent. of its income. Might it not well devote a little larger percentage in constructive work? Thirty per cent. looks a trifle out of proportion for the entire executive, legislative and judicial departments of our government, its waterways, forestry, postal service, light-houses, consular and diplomatic service, and the various other lines of constructive work.

"Commerce does not find encouragement in the wake of the fleet. True, it comes out and makes its bow at the passing of the battleships, like the cuckoo in the clock at the passing of the hour; but then it retires to consider how soon its day will have been told off; for the constant increase in war budgets, laying ever heavier burdens upon the people, and plunging the nations that are our best customers into bankruptcy, bodes ill to the ambitions of commerce.

"A modern battleship becomes practically useless in fifteen years; new inventions put it out of date; yet its

cost exceeds the valuation of all the land and the one hundred buildings Harvard University has accumulated in two hundred and fifty years, plus all the land and buildings of Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes.

"There is one destructive virtue, also, which we wish were found in the wake of the navy; that is, the destruction of the *internal enemies* of our national life. Every year more lives are lost in our country through ignorance, preventable disease and crime, than in all the wars we have ever had with foreign powers. If she would just leave behind some of those fine young men, salaried to do battle against some of these internal enemies, we wonder if our navy could make any nobler sacrifice for her country."

The Workers of Britain to the Workers of Germany.

We are very glad to be able to republish, from the *Arbitration*, the organ of the International Arbitration League, founded by William Randal Cremer in 1870, the Address, presented by the workers of Britain to the workers of Germany, on September 20, at the time of the Inter-parliamentary Conference at Berlin. The Address, the drafting of which was one of the last of Sir William's services to the cause of peace, was signed by more than three thousand representatives of labor in Great Britain, including forty-eight members of the House of Commons. It was presented at Berlin by a deputation of twenty British workers.

"*Brothers:* In the past wars were generally caused by the dynastic quarrels of monarchs, the intrigues and wrangling of statesmen, religious bickerings and persecutions, or racial prejudices. Some of these, indeed, still remain as potent causes of mischief, but to-day the most powerful agency for evil is that portion of the press which is owned and controlled by unprincipled capitalists, and we are pained at the frequent attempts of these journals to create strife between your country and ours; but we assure you that these sinister attempts are neither prompted nor endorsed by the workers of Britain. For many years the same evil agencies were successfully employed in creating dissension between the workers of France and ourselves, the people of both countries being taught to hate each other and waste their resources by invading each other in militarism and armaments, the almost incalculable cost of which had to be defrayed by the British and French peoples. Not only were these wasted millions extracted from the toilers, but for generations the people of both countries fought and killed each other like savages, the only persons who profited by the carnage being the usurers and personally interested classes. The masses paid and fought; the interested classes reaped the fruits of their insensate folly. At last, however, after long years of persistent efforts, peace has been secured by a treaty of arbitration being concluded between the two countries. That treaty is a TRIUMPH FOR THE WORKERS OF BRITAIN AND FRANCE, for it was they who, thirty-seven years ago, amidst obloquy and scorn, pioneered it, and ultimately secured